Applicant: Noriaki Sakamoto et al.

Attorney's Docket No.: 10417-072002 / F51
Serial No.: 10/622 997

160152M/SW

Serial No.: 10/622,997 Filed: July 18, 2003

Page : 6 of 8

## **REMARKS**

Claims 21-36 are pending. Claims 21, 25, 27-30 and 33 are currently amended.

Applicants thank the Examiner for allowing claims 21-26 and 34-36. Applicants note, however, that it is the subject matter of each claim as a whole that is patentable, not any particular feature recited in the claim(s). Applicants do not concede that the reasons for allowance given by the Examiner are the only reasons that make those claims allowable and do not make any admission or concession concerning the Examiner's statement.

Claims 21 and 25 have been amended merely to clarify the claimed subject matter. No new matter has been added. Applicants request that those claims remain allowable.

Claims 27-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,428,885 (Takaya et al.).

Claim 27 has been amended to recite that: 1) conductive patterns are exposed at an upper surface of a mounting board, 2) at least one conductive path is exposed at a rear surface of a semiconductor device disposed on the mounting board and 3) an insulating film is selectively formed on the rear surface of the semiconductor devices to insulate at least one of the exposed conductive path surfaces from at least one of the exposed conductive patterns.

An example of that is shown in FIG. 3A of the present application where conductive patterns 21E are exposed at an upper surface of the mounting board 10, conductive paths 51A, 51B are exposed through insulating resin 50 of a semiconductor device 53A that is disposed on the mounting board 10 and an insulating film RF is selectively formed to insulate portions of the exposed conductive paths 51A from the conductive patterns 21E. No new matter has been added.

By incorporating the features now recited in claim 1, a circuit device may advantageously include a conductive pattern on a mounting board 10 that extends across a rear surface of a semiconductor device 53A without accidentally contacting a conductive path 51A, 51B on the

Applicant: Noriaki Sakamoto et al.

Attorney's Docket No.: 10417-072002 / F51Serial No.: 10/622 997

160152M/SW

Serial No.: 10/622,997 Filed: July 18, 2003

Page : 7 of 8

semiconductor device 53A. (See page 28, lines 22-24) The Takaya et al. patent neither discloses nor suggests such features.

The Takaya et al. patent merely discloses a hybrid circuit with a laminated body 1D that includes a first inner wiring portion 17A. (See FIG. 4) The first inner wiring portion 17A includes multiple flat conductive layers 19. Insulating layers 18 are positioned between the flat conductive layers 19. Chips 2 are provided adjacent the first inner wiring portion 17A. A conductive surface pattern 10 is positioned at an upper surface of the first inner wiring portion 17A. The chips 2 and the conductive surface pattern 10 are at least partially covered with plastic 34. The insulating layers 18 insulate parts of adjacent conductive layers 19 from each other. The chips 2 do not include a conductive path exposed at a rear surface thereof. Nor is there an insulating film selectively formed on the chips 2 to insulate an exposed conductive path from a conductive surface pattern 10 on the first inner wiring portion 17a.

Claim 27 should be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 28-32 depend from claim 27 and, therefore, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 27.

Applicants have amended 28-30 and 33 to clarify the claimed subject matter. However, no new matter has been added.

Claim 33 also was rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(b) as being anticipated by the Takaya et al. patent.

Claim 33 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 27. Therefore, claim 33 should be allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with reference to claim 27.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this

Applicant: Noriaki Sakamoto et al.

Attorney's Docket No.: 10417-072002 / F51Serial No.: 10/622-997

160152M/SW

Serial No.: 10/622,997 Filed: July 18, 2003

Page : 8 of 8

paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Enclosed is a \$120 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

el Borodack

Date: December 8, 2005

Samuel Borodach Reg. No. 38,388

Fish & Richardson P.C. Citigroup Center 52nd Floor 153 East 53rd Street New York, New York 10022-4611 Telephone: (212) 765-5070

Facsimile: (212) 258-2291

30259116.doc